

Summary of Issues Discussed at July 8, 2009 UST Task Force Meeting

Topic	Regulator (Red)	Consultant (Green)	RP (Blue)	Other (Yellow)	Total
Closure		3	10		13
Better delineate clean-up goals for each site at the outset of assessment and remediation.					0
Dispute resolution	1			1	2
Cost feasibility considerations					0
Restore water quality	10	1			11
Statewide consistency of closure standards	2	7	3	7	19
Change or create policy on risk based closure not in conflict with Porter Cologne	3	9	4	2	18
Total					63
Risk Assessment	1	7	6	1	15
Goals should be risk-based	1	3	3	3	10
Receptors, Beneficial use, Closure vs. Best interest of the State	3	4	3	3	13
Mass flux analysis					0
Informed decision making	1	5	1	2	9
Total					47
Resolution Implementation					0
Save Cleanup Fund Money	5			1	6
Modify Existing Policy-change basin plans	1	11	2	4	18
Resolution Implementation		2		1	3
Total					27
Agency Accountability	1	4	4	2	11
Motivate regulators, perhaps with regular report cards					0
Cleanup schedule should be tighter, regulators should adhere to 60 day (or similar) turn around rule		1			1

Summary of Issues Discussed at July 8, 2009 UST Task Force Meeting

Topic	Regulator (Red)	Consultant (Green)	RP (Blue)	Other (Yellow)	Total
Regional and state board should provide technical assistance to LOPs/LIAs, as well as training. Where local shortages in man power or expertise persist consider allowing RPs/Consultants to bring in the assistance.					0
Prioritize sites that are close to closure, while also making a plan to aggressively address older cases. Where necessary the state board should clean up recalcitrant sites and look for the RP later.		1		1	2
Quicker dispute Resolution			2	6	8
Total					22
Investigation and Remediation	1				1
Regulators need to be more flexible.					0
Remediation should be allowed to begin during the site assessment phase, especially if this expedites source removal.	1				1
Also need to recognize that there is not a firm delineation between assessment and remediation					0
Agencies need more technical training/guidance for SV/VI cases					0
SCM Approach and DQO	3	2	2		7
Standard of care		4			4
Total					13
Other					0
Communication between different subgroups implementation					0
Look at other state programs		1		1	2
Interface with rest of resolution process		1			1
Institutional controls with financial safety net ex: deed restriction		2	1		3
MTBE Sources		2			2
Totals					8
Communications					0

Summary of Issues Discussed at July 8, 2009 UST Task Force Meeting

Topic	Regulator (Red)	Consultant (Green)	RP (Blue)	Other (Yellow)	Total
Recurring/annual meeting or conference.	1				1
Regular communications between agencies (i.e. wiki site, some sort of news letter or forum)					0
Better communications between Regulators, Consultants and RPs, perhaps in the form of a kick off meeting for each case	2			1	3
Better communication between regulators and consultants, and between consultants and RPs. Regulators should also be more available to banks and lenders (i.e. more communication among stakeholders),	1				1
Total					5
Reporting					0
Better standardize reporting requirements and formats, and also increase the consistency of regulation within and across agencies and regions.					0
All reports should include conclusions and recommendations section, and be uploaded electronically to Geotracker.					0
Goodricke uploads and maintenance need to be expressly stated to RPs and consultants, and must be taken into account by regulators when budgeting time management.					0
Corrective Action Plans should include Costs/cost estimates					0
Tie Goodricke with LUFT manual discussion site. Use site to catalogue successes and failures					0
Goodricke as central holder of data		1			1
Get historical information on Goodricke		2		1	3
Total					4
UST Cleanup Fund		1		1	2
System needs a peer review process to assess individual cases and industry wide methods as well as CF decisions.					0

Summary of Issues Discussed at July 8, 2009 UST Task Force Meeting

Topic	Regulator (Red)	Consultant (Green)	RP (Blue)	Other (Yellow)	Total
Accounting and administrative processes need improvement as the current system encourages poor quality work					0
Better communication between Agencies and USTCF, specifically with respect to Work plans and the pre-approval and reimbursable of high risk sites. Possibly in the form of CC: to CF in on all agency directives, and possibly through the placement of CF staff a		1			1
Quicker pre-approval, possibly through the addition of more staff, or by including the fund in the WP process.					0
Total					3
Analysis				1	1
Sample collection and analysis needs standardization					0
Standardize definitions and TPH ranges					0
Standardize Filtration and gel cleanup protocols				1	1
Total					2
Notes: Shaded cells indicate new issued/topics raised at July 8, 2009 Non-shaded cells indicate topics brought up at CA LUFT Manual					